REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 11 and 21 have been amended herein. Claims 1-27 remain pending in the case. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Request For Information

Applicant does not have any further literature, published applications or patents that were used to draft the instant application or was used in the invention process related to the aforementioned prior art modular video home distribution systems.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference signs mentioned in the description: 11a, 11b and 11c. Figure 1 has been amended to overcome this objection. A replacement set of drawings is submitted.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference signs mentioned in the description: J100, G100, J101, C109, L104, C215, S200, C209. Figures 3A and

3B have been amended to overcome this objection. A replacement set of drawings is submitted.

The drawings are objected to because it is not readily clear from the illustrations that Figure 3A and 3B form a single embodiment. Figures 3A and 3B have been amended to overcome this objection. A replacement set of drawings is submitted.

Claim Objections

Claim 16 is objected to because the recitation of "the first combiner circuit" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 16 has been amended to overcome this objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS
35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-15 and 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinwiddie et al. (6,481,013), hereafter referred to as Dinwiddie, in view of Applicant's prior art, in further view of Goyette (6,433,642), hereafter referred to as Goyette. The rejection is traversed for the following rational.

Dinwiddie and the present invention are very different. Dinwiddie may purport to teach a system for distributing signals over a network. However, Dinwiddie fails to teach or suggest "a first stage amplifier" and "a second stage

amplifier," as claimed. In contrast, Dinwiddie teaches a single stage amplifier circuit as opposed to the dual stage, as claimed.

Applicant's prior art may teach of a dual stage amplifier, however, Applicant's prior art fails to teach or suggest a "first stage amplifier having a high signal gain and a low noise figure" coupled to "a second stage amplifier having a high output power and a low distortion," as claimed. By combining a high gain, low noise first stage amplifier with a high power, low distortion second stage amplifier, the present invention provides improved conditioning of an output video signal that may support a greater number of distribution points not realized by the two stage amplifier admitted in Applicant's prior art.

Goyette fails to remedy the dificiencies of both Dinwiddie and the Applicant's prior art. In fact, Goyette teaches away from the claimed invention by teaching "first stage amplifier and second stage amplifier are separated by an equalizer" (column 3 lines 4-5). This teaches away from "a second stage amplifier having a high output power and a low distortion and having an input electrically coupled to the output of the first stage amplifier." The first and second amplifiers of Goyette are separated by a equalizer which is different from coupling the output of the first amplifier to the input of the second amplifier as claimed. Independent Claim 11 and Independent Claim 21 recite similar limitations. For this rational, Claims 1-15 and 19-27 are patentable over

Dinwiddie in view of Applicant's prior art in further view of Goyette. As such, allowance of Claims 1-15 and 19-27 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinwiddie in view of Applicant's prior art, in further view of Goyette, in further view of the RF2317 and RF2320 product brochures and yet in further view of Flickinger et al. (5,901,340), hereafter referred to as Fleckinger. The rejection is traversed for the following rational.

As presented above, Independent Claim 11 is patentable over Dinwiddie in view of Applicant's prior art in further view of Goyette. The RF2317 and RF2320 product brochures and Flickinger fail to remedy the deficiencies of Dinwiddie and Goyette. Flickinger may purport to teach cascading multiple distribution units, however, like Dinwiddie, Flickinger teaches away from the present invention by teaching a single amplifier stage. This is very different from "first stage amplifier having a high signal gain and a low noise figure" coupled to "a second stage amplifier having a high output power and a low distortion," as claimed. The combination of Dinwiddie, Applicant's prior art, Goyette, RF2317 and RF2320 product brochures and Flickinger fails to teach or suggest this limitation. For this rational, Claims 16-18 are patentable over Dinwiddie in view of Applicant's prior art, in further view of Goyette, in further view of the RF2317

and RF2320 product brochures and yet in further view of Flickinger. As such, allowance of Claims 16-18 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-27 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-27 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 8/3, 2005

Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060